What the MFDP Won, P. 3

On The Progress of Our Crusade to Save Vietnam

"Banmethuot, South Vietnam—Vietnamese troops have been terrorizing the civilian population in the central highlands . . . looting villages. . . ."

—N. Y. Times Service in York, Pa., Gazette, Sept. 18.

"Saigon—U.S. forces have been ordered to take special and continuing measures to decrease the number of civilians killed by American air strikes and military operations. . . . In an order issued Sept. 7, the U.S. Commander Gen. Westmoreland admonished his subordinates that the use of unnecessary force will embitter the population. . . . He called for tight control of air strikes."

—N. Y. Times Service in York, Pa., Gazette, Sept. 18.

"Saigon (AP)—A high ranking U.S. spokesman admitted American planes bombed the demilitarized zone [between North and South Vietnam] twice at the end of last week. . . . The second attack hit a South Vietnamese hamlet in the zone, killing 20 persons, including eight policemen. . . . Loudspeakers from the North Vietnamese side were blaring, 'The Americans are even bombing you now.'"

—Washington Post, Sept. 20.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIII, NO. 31 SEPTEMBER 27, 1965 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Mote In Our Own Eye

It would clarify the struggle for world peace, if attention were focussed on the resemblance between the Indian-Pakistani war and the war in Vietnam. The basic cause of the conflict in both is the failure to honor an obligation to hold free elections. A plebiscite to decide whether divided Kashmir would join India or Pakistan was promised by the British in 1947 and voted by the United Nations Security Council in 1948. The Indians have refused to allow a vote, for the same reason that we blocked the Vietnamese elections promised by the Geneva Conference of 1954—the Indians were sure they would lose. Having decided against free elections, the Indians were forced to use police state methods in ruling the part of Kashmir they held, just as we have been forced to do in South Vietnam. This course ended in Kashmir by alienating even pro-Indian Muslims whose great leader Sheikh Abdullah was and is again imprisoned, though he dreamed of a neutral solution in which an autonomous Kashmir would provide the bridge to reunite India and Pakistan.

India Follows Our Example

Similarly in South Vietnam, we have supported military dictatorship, suppressing all political parties lest they seek the peace and neutralism their war-weary people desire, but which would end our use of the country as a military bridgehead in Asia. In both Kashmir and South Vietnam, the suppression of opinion and the destruction of hope have given rise to a guerrilla uprising. This has had help from across the border, and India has retaliated by reprisal raids into Pakistan, as we have done with our air raids on North Vietnam. In the discussions before the cease-fire, India's terms were much like our own in Vietnam. India was prepared to accept a cease-fire if the guerrilla forces were withdrawn and Indian control of Kashmir left intact; but how distinguish between Muslim guerrillas native to Indian-held Kashmir and Muslim guerrillas from Pakistani-held Kashmir? It is clear that in both places, in the long run, there will be no peace without free elections and at least some neutral autonomous status between the contending great Powers. Indian internal politics have long blocked such a solution, as does ours in Vietnam.

India fears the effect of a humiliating withdrawal in Kashmir, as we do in Vietnam. But to India and Pakistan, Johnson and Goldberg preach law, and adherence to the UN Charter; they say nothing is worth what a war will cost the people, that compromise is necessary. Unfortunately there is no greater Power, which holds purse strings on us as we do on Indian and Pakistan, to force us to listen to the same arguments for a cease-fire in Vietnam. There we ignore the law and the Charter. We are burning up the country mercilessly, and our military are jubilant because neither Russia nor China has dared intervene. As our military see it, both wanted us to appear a paper tiger. We have made them appear paper tigers. What matter if the cost is paid in the blood of the people we purport to be liberating? And in the blood of our own sons? What matter if the shooting goes on for years? Vietnam has become a target practice ground for new weapons and new anti-guerrilla techniques. So talk of peace in Vietnam is dying down in Washington, while we achieve it in Kashmir. We were afraid the Indo-Pakistani war might interfere with ours in Vietnam. But what if the UN now turned and demanded a cease-fire there too?

What Did They Fear He Might See?

"Since the time of the Bay of Pigs fiasco when Mr. Arthur Sylvester, the voice of the Pentagon, asserted the government's right to lie to save itself, we have seen recurrent examples of news management. . . . Some time ago, Mr. President, after the Pentagon had claimed smashing victories in our air strikes against the North Vietnamese, I asked to see photographs of the damaged areas. I was told they were 'not available.' I asked why U.S. television networks were carrying films by Vietcong photographers but were seemingly unable to obtain footage showing the effects of our raids. There was no explanation."

—Hruska* (R. Neb.) *in the Senate, Sept. 15.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dodd's Reply The Same White House Rubbish Against Independent Press Coverage

Behind Fulbright's Attack on Our Intervention in the Dominican Republic

Of Fulbright's speech on the Dominican Republic (see box below), a number of things need to be said: 1. It was one of the few times in American history in which a U.S. Senator has spoken of Latin American policy with uncompromising objectivity. It will do our country good by making Latins feel there are still North Americans in high places who look on their problems with humane and sympathetic eye. 2. In the opinion of many well informed people here, however, it also reflects a breakdown of hope among liberal Senators that they could influence the President privately on foreign policy. It is thought that Fulbright spoke out publicly because he felt that he would not be heard otherwise. This means that the more optimistic atmosphere in the capital I reported on returning from vacation is beginning to dwindle. 3. The speech is not just about the past. It should be read carefully because of the shadow it casts over the future of the Dominican Republic. The U.S.-armed military are still powerful; the animosity to Bosch on our part is still there. Will we covertly support Trujillo's right-hand man Balaguer against Bosch?

Liberals Afraid to Speak Out

4. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is again demonstrating its inability fully to perform its function. Not only were its hearings on the Dominican Republic all held in private, but the Committee was unable to bring in a report. There is no reason why there could not have been majority and minority reports on the Dominican intervention. One suspects that the liberal majority was itself split and too fearful of the White House and anti-Communist stereotypes to speak out. So Fulbright's speech took the place of a committee report and Dodd's reply of a minority statement. On the floor only Morse and Clark dared support Fulbright though a substantial minority of the committee if not a majority privately agrees with the chairman on the Dominican Republic as on Vietnam. 5. Russell's speech Sept. 21 defending intervention in the Dominican Republic splits the ranks of those for negotiating peace in Vietnam.

LBJ's False Atrocity Figures

"U.S. policy was marred by a lack of candor and of misinformation. The former is illustrated by official assertions that U.S. military intervention was primarily for the purpose of saving American lives; the latter is illustrated by exaggerated reports of massacres and atrocities by the rebels—reports which no one has been able to verify. It was officially asserted, for example—by the President in a press conference statement on June 17 according to an official State Dept. bulletin—that 'some 1,500 innocent people were murdered and shot, and their heads cut off.' There is no evidence to support this statement."

—Fulbright in the Senate, Sept. 15.

6. Dodd and Fulbright represent two diametrically opposite approaches to foreign policy. Dodd with Eastland and their Internal Security subcommittee represent the paranoid approach, the last Senate committee operating on McCarthyite lines. Fulbright represents the civilized view. There has been bad blood between the two men ever since Fulbright exposed the fact that Dodd had been on the payroll of the Guatemalan dictatorship. Dodd supported Johnson for the Presidential nomination in 1960 and Johnson as a reward put him on Foreign Relations ahead of Clark, who had seniority. The assignment was an affront to the chairman. 7. The debate in the Senate last week brought out that Dodd had attended only one of the 13 sessions the committee held on the Dominican affair. His complaint about the "background information" pamphlet the Committee published was ludicrous and largely a smear attack on the *New York Times*, the *New York Herald-Tribune* and the *Washington Post* for their reporting from Santo Domingo. He did not really answer Fulbright at all but hashed up all the original Communist charges without even sifting out the since admitted factual errors. It was in short rubbish but it is the kind of rubbish the White House itself put out in its feud with press coverage of the intervention.

What North Americans Too Easily Forget About the Principle of Non-Intervention

"Article 15 of the Charter of the Organization of American States says that, 'No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatsoever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state.' Article 17 states that, 'The territory of a state is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily of military occupation . . . on any grounds whatever.' These clauses are not ambiguous. . . . It may be that we should never have accepted this commitment at Bogota in 1948; it is obvious from all the talk one hears these days about the obsoleteness of the principle of non-intervention that some U.S. officials regret our commitment to it. The fact remains that it . . . represents our word . . . embodied in a treaty which was ratified by the Senate Aug. 28, 1950. . . .

"We are currently fighting a war in Vietnam, largely, we are told, because it would be a disaster if the U.S. failed to honor its word. . . . I do not see why it is any less a matter of vital interest to honor a clear and explicit treaty obligation in the Americas than it is to honor the much more ambigous and less formal promises we have made to the South Vietnamese. . . .

"Many North Americans seem to believe that, while the U.S. does indeed participate in Latin American affairs from time to time, sometimes by force, it is done with the best of intentions . . . and therefore cannot really be considered intervention. The trouble with this point of view is that it is not shared by our neighbors to the South. Most of them do think they need protection from the United States and the history of the Monroe Doctrine and the 'Roosevelt corollary' suggest that their feelings are not entirely without foundation. . . . However much it may hurt our feelings, they prefer to have their security based on some more objective standard than the good intentions of the U.S. The standard on which they rely most heavily is the principle of non-intervention. . . .

"In the eyes of educated, energetic and patriotic young Latin Americans—which is to say, the generation that will make or break the Alliance for Progress—the U.S. committed a worse offense in the Dominican Republic than just intervention; it intervened against social revolution and in support, at least temporarily, of a corrupt, reactionary military oligarchy." *—Fulbright in the Senate, Sept. 15.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Challenge Lost, But A Giant Step Forward: Eastland Up At Next Election

For the First Time Since 1882, Miss. Negroes Reappear on House Floor

For the first time in history Negro women—three of them—were seated on the floor of the House of Representatives. For the first time since 1882, when Mississippi last had a Negro Congressman, Negroes from that State appeared on the floor of the House. A Negro party, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, a political freak in the one-party South, exerted enough influence to muster 143 votes against 228 in its fight to unseat the Mississippi delegation. This was far from being a defeat. It was a giant step forward. And it was achieved despite the hostility of the Negro Establishment in the North, the defection of many liberals and the social squeamishness of certain Negro Congressmen. Adam Clayton Powell asked Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, "Do you know who I am?" in the tone of a man who felt himself God's gift to Negritude. Mrs. Hamer said she did but refused to yield to his plea that the three women stay off the floor. He said it would cost the MFDP votes, but the three women must have felt more snobbery than strategy in the appeal. They sat and made history.

The Villains of The Piece

The villains of the piece were the leaders of the liberal Democratic Study Group. Holifield *(D. Cal.)* was paired for the resolution to dismiss. Blatnik *(D. Minn.)* and O'Hara *(D. Mich.)* voted for it. The latter as vice-chairman had been given a special assignment to the Mississippi challenge. The major architect of the defeat was Frank Thompson *(D. N. J.)* chairman of the DSG, (see box this page) and a member of the House Administration Committee which passed on the challenge. He told Republicans on the committee the DSG membership would largely support the motion to dismiss. It did not do so, most of them voted the other way, but this was enough to make friendly Republicans hesitate to come out to the left of the Democratic "left."

So 400 Misssissippi Negroes come north to listen in from the gallery—itself a portent of a changing era—heard all kinds of obscure rules cited against them in favor of men who did not hesitate to break more fundamental rules against the Negro effort to vote: rules against murder (at least five in the vote drive since 1961), against bombings (17 churches, homes and businesses from June to October of last year alone, false arrests (32) and beatings (9).

Six hundred witnesses risked life and livelihood to testify to all this lawlessness; 200 volunteer lawyers spent close to a half a million dollars drawing up their depositions in 3,000 pages. This was never considered by the committee nor even circulated to members of the House for consideration. Thompson could have forced hearings. If Speaker McCormack had had his way, there would not even have been a roll call. It was the Republican Curtis of Missouri who outwitted him and forced the members to stand up and be counted. The MFDP was counted out this time, but after that burst of tears on the Capitol steps, the Mississippi Negroes went home with new determination. They deserve national support in preparing for next year's election, when Eastland comes up for a new term—and MFDP opposition.

Two Contrasting Northern Liberal Views

"Would due process be served in attempting to correct almost 100 years of acknowledged wrong to our Negro citizens in Mississippi and other States by applying House precedents created during the stormy Reconstruction Congresses whose harsh enactments helped create and foster the closed society which over the years is responsible for these injustices?"

—Thompson (D. N.J.) *who voted with the South to dismiss the Mississippi challenge, and whose reasoning Dixie-style blames Reconstruction rather than White Supremacy for Negro disenfranchisement.*

"The majority report [for dismissing the challenge] gives dominant weight to the proposition that 'whatever electoral practices may have occurred in Mississippi during the 1964 elections, it is doubtful that any disenfranchisement, even if proven here, would have actually affected the outcome. . . . 'There are few districts in the predominantly one-party South where the number of potential [i.e. Negro] voters . . . could alter the outcome. . . . The majority says that the Voting Rights Act 'provides thorough and complete remedies for any and all such discrimination and disenfranchisement.' The act's authors had no such illusions, and its diehard opponents make clear every day that they hold no such fears."

—Ryan (D. N.Y.) *who led the fight for the challenge.*

A New Form of Dum-Dum Bullet for Use Against New Forms of Colonial Uprising

"High-lethality AR-18 lightweight automatic rifle will provide capability for virtually tripling firepower of NATO-equipped combat troops. . . . After conferring with military and political leaders. . . . Armalite President Chas. H. Dorchester became convinced of the urgent need for such a weapon. . . . Mass production can help strengthen the Free World against future aggression, while offering a substantial return to investors. . . . Highly effective in guerrilla warfare and against human wave assault-type tactics."

—Advertisement in the Wall St. Journal, Sept. 21.

The ad failed to mention that this new rifle fires a modern version of the dum-dum bullet outlawed by the Hague convention of 1899. The British developed them in an arsenel at Dum Dum outside Calcutta for use against colonial uprisings in India and the Sudan. "Their peculiarity," the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* explained, "consisted in their expanding on impact and thus creating an ugly wound, and they had been adopted in Indian frontier fighting owing to the failure of the usual type of bullet to stop the rushes of fanatical tribesmen." Rumors of their use by the British in the Boer War provoked protest and led to their outlawry. The Armalite is a modernized version of this Kipling era weapon for use against "lesser breeds outside the law." It has been tried out in Vietnam. It shoots a bullet so light that that it "tumbles". Instead of a sharp, clean wound, it tears a gash in the flesh, usually causing death from shock. This "splash effect" recalls that the Hague Declaration forbade the use of bullets "which expand or flatten easily in the human body." The U.S. did not sign this treaty but it has become part of "world declaratory law" binding on all nations, whether signatory or not, as the U.S. argued at the Nuremberg trial. Thus civilization marches on.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

McNamara's Latest Paradox: How Arms Sales Abroad Bring About Arms Reduction!

If We Were A New Yorker We'd Now Be for Lindsay for Mayor

If we lived in New York, we'd vote for John V. Lindsay for Mayor, to break the hold of a stale Democratic machine on the city and to start an able young liberal on his way up in the Republican party, as competition for the Democrats. . . . Israelis, watching the India-Pakistan war, are worried about State Department assurances that U.S. arms given the Arab States would be used only against Communist aggression or "internal security" since similar assurances were given the Indians and the Pakistanis. . . . When Secretary McNamara boasted at his Sept. 16 press conference that in four years the U.S. had sold $9 billion worth of arms abroad, he was asked, "as you know, you have been urging the Saudis to buy the F-5. I wonder when you undertake the foreign sales how much weight you give to the consideration that such sales might increase the tension in certain areas?" McNamara never answered the question about Saudi Arabia but claimed that the Pentagon uses the leverage given it by arms gifts and sales to get underdeveloped countries "to reduce the share of their resources devoted to defense." It would take a Mark Twain to do justice to this idea that arms salesmen are really engaged somehow in negotiating disarmament!

The Jews in The Soviet Union

According to an *Agence France Presse* dispatch from Havana in Le Monde (Sept. 14), a new book by Che Guevara "Socialism and Man in Cuba" has gone on sale in Havana. . . . Although we believe it does Russian Jewry a disservice to make it a tool of the cold war, we think independent protest called for. The Soviet Union is the only Soviet state in which internal passports are stamped with a J for Jewish, and the Jews are also the one national minority in the Soviet Union which does not enjoy cultural freedom. *Pravda's* (Sept. 12) attack on anti-Semitism, the first of its kind in years, shows the effect of criticism from abroad. . . . Philosophically, the debate at the Ecumenical Council in Rome over religious liberty is closely akin to the debate over Stalinism (and Maoism) in the Soviet world. When the conservative Cardinal Ottoviani, secretary of the Holy Office (i.e. the Inquisition) said "Truth and falsehood cannot be given equal value. Special care must be taken to protect the unlettered" i.e. from "error" he was also expressing the Communist view that the State (like the Church) possesses the only valid truth and has a right therefore to protect the public from false doctrine. . . .

The day we called attention (Sept. 20) to Secretary Rusk's speech in May, 1951, declaring Communist China completely a puppet of Moscow, the *Newsletter* of the GOP Congressional Committee turned up with a speech Rusk made on January 13, 1950, comparing the Chinese Communist revolution to 1776 and saying it was "not aiming toward dictatorship" and "not Russian in essence." Rusk called this a canard but the GOP newsletter came up with a report of the speech at the time from the staid *Philadelphia Bulletin*. We never dreamt the Secretary was such an acrobat.

Dodd's Attack on Martin Luther King

"When Dr. Martin Luther King takes advantage of his pulpit as the prime leader of the civil rights movement in this country, to call for the admission of Red China to the United Nations; to demand that the U.S. commit itself to negotiate with the Vietcong; and to advocate that the U.S. reorient its foreign policy along the lines of accommodation with communism, then I can only regret that the leader of the civil rights movement, by his intemperate alignment with the forces of appeasement in foreign policy, has alienated much of the support which he previously enjoyed in Congress. . . . It is nothing short of arrogance when Dr. King takes it upon himself to undermine the policies of the President. . . . There has already been too much private intervention in the sphere of foreign policy, and I think that the time has come when Congress will have to look into this entire situation with a view to drawing up more stringent statutes than now exist.."

Dodd (D. Conn.) *in the Senate, Sept. 15.*

Next day Senator Young (D. Ohio) reminded Senator Dodd of the First amendment, told the Senate Dr. King had as much right to express his view as Dodd, and put into the Congressional Record an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Sept. 11, advocating admission of China to the UN.

We Now Offer Special Rates for Schoolroom Bulk Subscriptions

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

9/27/65

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED